

Message

From: d'Almeida, Carolyn K. [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=9EC4401AFA1846DD93D52A0DDA973581-CDALMEID]
Sent: 6/21/2016 8:39:13 PM
To: Wayne Miller [Miller.Wayne@azdeq.gov]
Subject: RE: 2016-6-21 - wafb - Draft Joint Agency Response to June 7 AF letter - june 15 version AH TLP - ST012 SEE EBR -

We had a discussion with Angeles and attorneys this morning. The problem when attorneys get involved they get pretty specific about what constitutes an emergency. Unclear if plume spreading constitutes and "imminent and substantial endangerment" unless drinking water immediately effected, or immediate public health threat, e.g.: Gold King Mine, Fukushima, etc. But definitely will be elevating these concerns. Angeles will be participating on the BCT call tomorrow. Need to get her briefed to a level that she can elevate. Process for stop work under FFA is just a phone call.

From: Wayne Miller [mailto:Miller.Wayne@azdeq.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2016 1:31 PM
To: d'Almeida, Carolyn K. <dAlmeida.Carolyn@epa.gov>
Subject: 2016-6-21 - wafb - Draft Joint Agency Response to June 7 AF letter - june 15 version AH TLP - ST012 SEE EBR -

The letter facts appear straight forward and the points appear reasonable.
Tina is back and I will forward unless you have a recent version.

I believe the Agency is supportive, but please note that unless future AZ development can be proven impacted, ADEQ management may be hesitant to fully commit stop work. Management leadership team has split opinion on a few of points: (1) AMEC is characterizing (to a degree) by placing multiple wells around known NAPL points – so technically they are complying (just maybe to a degree and extent that some ADEQ folk may want). (2) AMEC has stated the approach is a phase approach, so wait until AMEC defers before demanding action. (3) Will future GW production use be impacted (While aquifer restoration can be a goal, does aquifer restoration have to be the only end-all goal...given that significant distance east of liquid fuel tank farm likely industrial or not buildable).

NA2SO4 TEA arsenic issue still being researched.

From: d'Almeida, Carolyn K. [mailto:dAlmeida.Carolyn@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2016 12:10 PM
To: Henning, Loren <Henning.Loren@epa.gov>; Butler, Thomas <Butler.Thomas@epa.gov>
Cc: Wayne Miller <Miller.Wayne@azdeq.gov>
Subject: 2016-6-15 - wafb - Draft - Joint Agency Response to June 7 AF letter - AH TLP - ST012 SEE EBR - CDA EPA

Wayne /all

Use this version of the response letter let me know what you think; I made a few changes to the earlier version that I sent.

I am looking through the 2012 ROD now. The selected remedy to remove LNAPL at the site was alternative 3: SEE + EBR. The ROD did not distinguish between a SEE

treatment zone and an EBR treatment zone for LNAPL, they were intended to be sequential treatments. There was an Alternative 4 that was evaluated that was for EBR + ozonation which Amec is now defaulting to (without ozonation as they are selecting the slower anaerobic process) for the areas outside of the SEE treatment zone. Need to read that section for reasons why alternative 4 was not selected. But nevertheless they are trying to push a fundamental change to the remedy.

Carolyn

From: Henning, Loren
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2016 10:57 AM
To: Butler, Thomas <Butler.Thomas@epa.gov>
Cc: d'Almeida, Carolyn K. <dAlmeida.Carolyn@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Draft Response Letter to AF from AH and TLP re ST012 SEE EBR

I'm having an update with Angeles tomorrow so will have some direction to share then.

Loren

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 15, 2016, at 10:54 AM, Butler, Thomas <Butler.Thomas@epa.gov> wrote:

<image001.gif>

I'm fine with this concept. I would word-smith it a touch before going final, but we need to loop in ADEQ first anyway so it may make sense for me to wait to see their approach. Regardless, we kind of need this to move quickly, so once you've heard from Loren, if you can convey it to Wayne with a sense of urgency, that'd be helpful.

From: d'Almeida, Carolyn K.
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2016 9:22 AM
To: Butler, Thomas <Butler.Thomas@epa.gov>; Henning, Loren <Henning.Loren@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Draft Response Letter to AF from AH and TLP re ST012 SEE EBR

I embellished the letter a bit with technical details - see how this reads

From: Butler, Thomas
Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2016 5:21 PM
To: d'Almeida, Carolyn K. <dAlmeida.Carolyn@epa.gov>; Henning, Loren <Henning.Loren@epa.gov>
Subject: Draft Response Letter to AF from AH and TLP re ST012 SEE EBR

All,

I don't know exactly where we are with this anymore, but I've drafted a short and sweet response essentially asking for Phil to engage with Angeles/Tina on this set of ST012 issues. I reference the FFA, including Section 11 (which contains the Work Stoppage section), without invoking it.

Let me know how you want to move forward.

Thanks,

Thomas

Thomas B. Butler
Assistant Regional Counsel, Office of Regional Counsel
United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX
75 Hawthorne Street ORC-3
San Francisco, California 94105
Direct Dial Phone: (415) 972-3869
Receptionist: (415) 947-8705
Fax: (415) 947-3570
butler.thomas@epa.gov

NOTICE: This e-mail (and any attachments) may contain PRIVILEGED OR CONFIDENTIAL information and is intended only for the use of the specific individual(s) to whom it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged and confidential under state and federal law. This information may be used or disclosed only in accordance with law, and you may be subject to penalties under law for improper use or further disclosure of the information in this e-mail and its attachments. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify the person named above by reply e-mail, and then delete the original e-mail. Thank you.